

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
COLUMBIA DIVISION**

United States of America,	)	Civil Action No.: 3:20-cv-01438-JMC
Plaintiff,	)	
v.	)	<b>ORDER</b>
2019 Dodge Challenger Coupe and	)	
Daquan Tyreek Funchess-Johnson,	)	
Defendants,	)	
Samuel L. Funchess,	)	
Claimant.	)	

---

This matter is before the court upon review of the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation (“Report”) (ECF No. 41) filed on September 22, 2020, recommending that the court grant the Government’s Motion to Strike (ECF No. 20). For the reasons set forth below, the court **ACCEPTS** the Magistrate Judge’s Report (ECF No. 41) and **GRANTS** the Government’s Motion to Strike (ECF No. 20).

**I. RELEVANT BACKGROUND**

The Report sets forth the relevant facts, which this court incorporates herein without a full recitation. As brief background, the Government filed this civil forfeiture action on April 15, 2020. (ECF No. 1.) Claimant Samuel L. Funchess (“Claimant”) subsequently filed a claim asserting an ownership interest in the subject property on May 8, 2020. (ECF No. 7.)

On June 5, 2020, the Government filed the instant Motion to Strike Claimant’s claim. (ECF No. 20.) The Magistrate Judge submitted a Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 41) to the court on September 22, 2020. The Report recommended that the court grant the Government’s

Motion to Strike (ECF No. 20) because Claimant had not filed an Answer despite being warned that failure to file an Answer may result in his claim being struck (ECF No. 27). (ECF No. 41 at 1-2.)

## **II. STANDARD OF REVIEW**

The Magistrate Judge's Report is made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina. The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court, which has no presumptive weight. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The responsibility to make a final determination remains with this court. *Id.* at 271. The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objections are made. *Diamond v. Colonial Life and Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005).

In the absence of objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report, this court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting its recommendation. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). Rather "in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.'" *Diamond*, 416 F.3d at 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note). Furthermore, failure to file specific objections to the Report results in a party's waiver of the right to appeal from the judgment of the District Court based upon such recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985).

## **III. ANALYSIS**

The parties were advised of their right to file objections to the Report. (ECF No. 41 at 3.) Objections to the Report were due by October 6, 2020. (*Id.*) Neither of the parties filed objections

to the Report. Since no specific objections were filed by either party and the Report does not contain clear error, the court adopts the Report herein. *See Camby*, 718 F.2d at 199; *Diamond*, 416 F.3d at 315.

#### **IV. CONCLUSION**

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case, the court finds that the Report provides an accurate summary of the facts and law and does not contain clear error. Therefore, the court **ACCEPTS** the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 41) and **GRANTS** the Government's Motion to Strike (ECF No. 20).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**



United States District Judge

February 8, 2021  
Columbia, South Carolina